The Text of the Arthaśāstra
Author(s): D. D. Kosambi
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 78, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1958), pp. 169-173
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/595286
Accessed: 09/02/2015 02:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

j. *Bāṅglā-sāhityer-itihās*, by Sukumar Sen; 2nd edition 1948, published by the Modern Book Agency, Calcutta. The first volume of this extensive and extremely valuable literary history deals with the period of the present interest.

2. English

a. *History of Brajabuli Literature*, by Sukumar Sen; Calcutta University, 1935. A selection, translation, and commentary upon a wide range of Brajabuli *padas*, including some *Gaurapadas*. Most valuable is the biographical information on the poets themselves, together with *padas* drawn from unpublished MSS.

b. *Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement*, by Sushil Kumar De; General Printers and Publishers, Calcutta, 1942. An excellent history of the early phases of the Caitanya movement, from both Sanskrit and Bengali sources.

c. *The Caitanya Movement*, by Melville T. Kennedy; Association Press, Calcutta, 1925.

d. *History of the Bengali Language and Literature*, by Dinesh Candra Sen; 2nd edition, Calcutta University, 1954.

e. *Caitanya and His Companions*, by Dinesh Candra Sen; Calcutta University, 1917.

f. *Caitanya and His Age*, by Dinesh Candra Sen; Calcutta University, 1922.

g. *Bengali Literature*, by J. C. Ghosh; Oxford University, 1948.

THE TEXT OF THE ARTHAŚĀSTRA

D. D. KOSAMBI

TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH

THE DISCOVERY of the Pāṭaṇ Bhaṇḍār palm-leaf fragments (dated on palaeographic grounds at about the 11-12th century A. D.) was the first real step forward in the textual problem of the *Arthaśāstra* since the appearance of printed editions [1] based on southern texts. Ācārya-Śrī Jinavijaya Muni has made the new material available to all scholars, and lightened their future labours, by his comparative edition (printed, but not yet published) of the Pāṭaṇ folios. The actual text-fragment covers the whole of the first book (*adhikaraṇa*) except the very beginning, the first six chapters of the second, and substantial portions of 2.7 and 2.10. Here, the gloss is in the form of minuscule notes on the margin by several different hands. The other part with the commentary of Yogghama extends, with lacunae, only over the first three chapters of book two and the opening of the fourth. Nevertheless, the importance of the material is far greater than its relative extent, because substantial contributions are made thereby not only to the problem of the *Arth.* transmission, but to Indian textual criticism in general.

1. To consider minor points first: The author's personal name, also preserved by the later drama *Mudrārākṣasa*, seems to have been Viṣṇugupta. Cāṇakya is presumably the patronymic; the possible connection of this appellation with a *Caṇakarāja-nīti* reported in the Tibetan Tanjur [2] is not clear. The *gotra* name by which the brahmin author would be known outside his gens was generally taken as Kauṭilya, and the *gotra* name survives in that form today.[3] However, T. Gaṇapati

[1] R. Shāma Sāstrī, 1st ed. (Mysore, 1909); 2nd ed. (1919); 3rd (1924). T. Gaṇapati Śāstri (Trivandrum, 1923-5; in three parts, with a commentary, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 79, 80, 82). J. Jolly and R. Schmidt (Lahore, 1923-5). The fine German translation by J. J. Meyer (Leipzig, 1926) deserves special mention.

[2] In the Tanjur Catalogue by M. Lalou; but no analysis of the specific text is available to me.

[3] J. Brough, *The Early Brahmanical System of Gotra and Pravara* (the *Gotra-pravara-mañjarī* of Puruṣottama) (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 82, 88, 96 (Bhrgus); 107, 109 (Gautamas; a Kuḷkarṇī family with this *gotra* was reported by V. T. Sheṭe: *Śukla-Yajurvedīya-Mādhyandina*

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Śāstri showed that the correct form should be Kauṭalya, and adopted it for his own edition (beyond the initial fascicules). The Pāṭaṇ folios resolve the question by writing the name uniformly as Kauṭalya, which is also a strong variant in the Mysore edition, and must be taken hereafter as definitively established. The change in orthography was due, in all probability, to obsolescence of the rare name, and a false derivation from *kuṭila* = crooked, an adjective that could easily be applied to the author's writings from the point of view of later *nīti* morality.

Similarly, the discovery is not without significance for the problem of authenticity, which scholars like Keith [4] have disputed with acrid and even rabid expression of views in theological intensity. A set of folios, even of the 12th century, that comes to light in Rājasthān or Kāṭhiāwār, cannot disprove the arbitrary conjecture that the work was forged in the name of the Magadhan chancellor by some Western Indian upstart, say about 300 A. D. However, the actual glosses make Keith's view even more unlikely than before. Not only does the codex prove the antiquity of the Kauṭalyan tradition, but the glossators are shown by their vocabulary to be Jains and Buddhists. The late 12th century was so full of upheavals in the North, due primarily to the steady advance of Muslim religious and military penetration, that such a work could most plausibly have been brought from some distant, peripheral *vihāra* (like Jagaddala) on the verge of extinction, by scholars who preferred coming south to exile in Nepal or Tibet. Had it been a local effort in Western India, we should have expected more copies. Neither Buddhists nor Jains could have had any reason to adopt a forgery of about 300 A. D. as genuine, whatever a brahmin scholar might have done.

The much-discussed *Śukranīti*, which some insist upon taking as a document of the Gupta period (in spite of five references to gunpowder, and a good formula for its preparation), is nothing but a 19th century forgery by Oppert's Sanskrit pandits at the Presidency College, Madras. For this information, I am indebted to Prof. V. Rāghavan. At least, the Pāṭaṇ fragments are a guarantee against such recent provenance for the *Arth.*

2. The critical *Mahābhārata* Prolegomena of V. S. Sukṭhaṇkar,[5] followed by Ruben's [6] critical sample-survey for the *Rāmāyaṇa*, show what happened in India to great popular narratives. In general, the North preserves a shorter version without regard to grammatical polish and Pāṇinian rules, while the South inflates and rearranges in the interest of logic. In particular, the Kaśmīri in the North and Malayālī in the South often preserve archaic readings. For smaller works preserved in numerous copies and local versions, my own work on Bhartṛhari's epigrams yields somewhat different results, when due allowance is made for the formlessness of verses collected by different redactors without the logical nexus of a story or drama. The South again shows logical rearrangement and rigid attention to syntax; the North presents growth by accretion but preserves archaisms.

A better 'experimental control' than the *Mbh.* or Bhartṛhari's epigrams is furnished by the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, modelled carefully upon the *Arth.*, with comparable phraseology and style. The main difference is that this work, though not for the vulgar herd, was always studied (for erotic titillation at least) by the literati, and the transmission has no gaps, so that the text must be classified as 'popular' in the present sense. The *Kāmasūtra* preface lists the work as having 7 books, divided into 36 *adhyāyas* or 64 *prakaraṇas*, with a total content of 1250 *ślokas*. In fact, 67 *prakaraṇa* titles have actually been given. The *grantha* count is found to be about 1482, not including *adhyāya* colophons. The error of 232 *granthas* far exceeds any permissible error in estimation on the part of scribe, copyist, or author. The argument that the prefatory chapter of the *Arth.* or of the *Kāmasūtra* is spurious, and the figures given interpolated, is not sensible, as the forger would have been careful to give an accurate count to validate his own text. It may thus be taken as proved that the *Arth.* text has been eroded by neglect, due to its lack of popularity. The *Kāmasūtra* has unquestionably been

brāhmaṇāṃcī gotrāvalī (in Marāṭhī), 2nd ed. (Poona, 1951), p. 33.

[4] Keith, A. B., *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford, 1928; photo-reprint, 1941), pp. xvii-xx, 458-62; see also, Jolly's preface to the Lahore edition, and M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur*, III, 518 ff., for doubts as to the authenticity; see also note 8, below.

[5] V. S. Sukṭhaṇkar, *Memorial Edition* (Bombay, 1944), vol. I, pp. 10-140, from his edition of the *Ādi-parvan* (*BORI*, critical edition, vol. I, Poona, 1933).

[6] W. Ruben: *Studien zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa* (Stuttgart, 1936). See also, the Bhartṛhari edition by D. D. Kosambi, Singhi Jain Series, no. 23.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

inflated by those who pored over it so closely through the centuries, though the absence of a critical edition makes it impossible to trace the additions here.

The *Arth.* problem is not similar. The work was never popular in any sense of the word, being at first a special treatise for princes and their high councillors, and later a rare book studied only by the most erudite, *e. g.* Daṇḍin, Bāṇa, and Rājaśekhara. Most of the technical terms had become obscure long before the commentators came upon the scene, though some (like the verb *apavah-*) now reflect a remarkable light because of the Asokan edicts. In any case, the work is represented by very few copies and was, indeed, lost completely till 1905. All southern manuscripts (including those in Kerala, Adyar, Mysore and in Europe) seem to derive from a single original, which could not have been the Pāṭaṇ text.

The immediate peculiarities of transcription are not very informative. The southerners often interchange the prefixes *apa* and *ava*, without substantial change in the meaning. The northern folios have some local peculiarities such as an occasional *Parāsara* for *Parāśara*. North contains somewhat more matter for the same portion than South. Some of this can be explained (as perhaps in 1.19 = p. 46) by a marginal gloss having entered into a later copy of the text. The explanation is not too attractive, for the *Arth.* (and in imitation the later *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana) combines *sūtra* maxims in a running text with brief *bhāṣya* type explanations.

The largest additions in Jinavijayaji's text are of 5½ *granthas* in 1.9 plus a tag *anuṣṭup* at the end; 7½ *ślokas* in tag verses at the end of 2.2; three *granthas* or so in 2.3. The remaining differences are of a word or phrase scattered at random. The additional matter in the North cannot generally be explained by such inflation, nor the occasional word or phrase in the southern (printed) texts missing in these palm-leaf finds. To cut short the discussion: it seems to me that THE DIVERGENCE CAN BEST BE EXPLAINED BY LONG NEGLECT AND PROGRESSIVE DYING OUT OF THE TRADITION. That is, most copyists were not ignorant professional scribes but scholars of ability who changed as little as possible. But they were totally unable to comprehend the forgotten technical terms and fundamentally different social structure of a vanished epoch; and there were so few of them that the occasional loss of a word, phrase, or short passage in each transcription was not compensated by any matter added by mistake. This applies both to North and South. The main reason the northern copy contains a little more is that it is older. The Southerners had at least six centuries more of recopying in which to accumulate the slow losses. Had the work been popular or obligatory reading (like Pāṇini's grammar) no such loss would have occurred.

3. By substantiating most of the readings of the list of contents in 1.1, the new discoveries permit inner criticism which reveals losses in the text very much greater than might have been estimated by the direct comparison of the surviving textual matter in the portion covered by the Northern folios. THE PRINTED ARTH. TEXT WOULD HAVE TO BE AUGMENTED BY ABOUT TWENTY FIVE PERCENT IN ORDER TO REACH THE ORIGINAL EXTENT OF THE WORK.

This conclusion points in the same direction as comparative study of the codices, but it has a totally different basis. The list of contents gives the extent of the whole work as 15 books (*adhikaraṇa*) in 180 sections (prakaraṇa) or 150 chapters (*adhyāya*), and 6000 *ślokas*. The last cannot refer to the actual stanzas found in the book. The word *śloka* must here be taken with T. Gaṇapati Śāstri as the *grantha* unit of 32 syllables. Such is the uniform practice of early scribes in describing their copy. The stray *anuṣṭup* quarters one can pick out of the *Arth.* text come from the genius of the Sanskrit language and not from a lost metrical original, as some would like to believe. The round number 6000 may be suspected but, at worst, it ought to be a reasonable estimate made by counting every letter on a few sample [7] folios, whether of the original composition, or of the archetype of the definitive redaction. The possibility that a rough *grantha* count, had at some time been made for the whole work is not entirely to be excluded. Even Daṇḍin, in the final chapter of his *Daśakumāracaritam* refers to Cāṇakya's précis of *daṇḍanīti* written for the Maurya as being 6000 *ślokas* in extent; so the traditional count is old, and no variant known. That Daṇḍin referred to the *Arth.* and not to another work of Cāṇakya is clear from the detailed raillery in Prince Viśruta's adventure. Not only is the entire chapter charged with Kauṭalyan ideas, but the phraseology is unquestionably

[7] D. D. Kosambi, "The Parvasaṃgraha of the Mahābhārata," *JAOS*, 66 (1946), 110-117.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

derived from our text of the *Arth.* In particular, all the details of the king's daily routine are taken unchanged from *Arth.* 1.16, and some are exact quotations, e. g., *tṛtīye tūryaghoṣena saṃviṣṭaḥ caturtha-pañcamau śayīta.* It is possible to go further, and to state that Daṇḍin's text was, in some particulars at least, nearer to the present fragment of the Northern tradition than to any surviving Southern text. South, as we now have it, repeats *svādhyāyaṃ ca kurvīta* (along with the bath and the dinner) for the third eighth of the day and the second of the night. Both North and Daṇḍin's raillery leave out the first of these.

In counting the text, the question still remains of changes in the number of syllables due to the chapter headings, colophons, variant readings and *saṃdhi* not rigidly enforced. The Pāṭaṇ folios, and the custom of other manuscripts of the oldest known periods show that a chapter would have had a colophon, but no rubric. The colophons of the Pāṭaṇ text are always shorter than those of the printed editions. A rough (unchecked) count, syllable by syllable, of Shāma Sāstri's (3rd) Mysore edition gives *4640 ślokas*, including the colophons, but not the chapter headings. The combined error from all the causes mentioned above, and from miscounting, would be less than *100* such *grantha* units, in either direction.

To compare results with the traditional scribe's estimate, the counts were taken of 7½% of the pages in the same edition. Alternate half-letters not combined in a ligature were counted to give a slight overestimate, simply to allow for the same tendency in a professional copyist paid by the amount of work done. The estimate thus obtained was *4762* slokas of 32 syllables each, with a standard deviation of *108*. A scribe's estimate from his manuscript would have been more accurate than from the printed pages. The manuscripts write the text continuously whereas the modern publication separates the words within the line, and further breaks up the text into small paragraphs, sometimes of half a line, so that the variation per page in this work at least is decidedly greater than from folio to folio of a manuscript. Any codex would continue with a gap of much less than a line when a chapter or a book ended, where the printed *Arth.* texts leave more space, insert headings and colophons in different types. The deficit of about 1200 *granthas* is not to be denied. The difference is much too great to be explained by a miscount in antiquity.

The deficit in the *Arth.* text can actually be taken as another argument in support of its general (overall) authenticity. Any forger would have been careful to give full measure. The original text seems to have leaked away over the centuries, for lack of application to current administrative problems. The result is that small bits have disappeared from every portion. In a late document, a defect of the magnitude we have just measured would have arisen mainly from missing folios, which means that the gaps would be long, connected passages. At no place does the surviving Northern text show a folio-size difference from the southern.

4. It does not reduce our difficulties in any way to note that even the enumeration by sections does not coincide in North and South. The Northern text actually lists a total of *184* sectional titles though the number is given as *180*. The list agrees in books 1, 4-6, 8, 11-12, and 15. North contains three more in book 2, two more in book 14, one each in 7 and 10; it contains one less than the South in each of books 3, 9, and 13. The southern total is, therefore, accurately *180* sections. The difference arises primarily by combining two adjacent sections, or subdividing a long title. The original scribe had completely omitted the contents of the fifth book in the Pāṭaṇ folios of 1.1; this has been entered on the margin in minuscule by another hand. One hitherto unknown sectional title in the second book is illegible on the northern folios of 1.1; the seventh book contains one and the fourteenth two more new ones, not found in the South. Just how much additional matter these might have yielded cannot now be conjectured, but one could not reasonably expect more than *250 granthas*, if indeed these sections really had a separate existence.

It is possible to show by internal criticism that missing passages are indicated in certain contexts. Shāma Sāstri's indispensable word-index to the *Arth.* (3 vols., Mysore 1924-25) records *78* places where the author refers to himself with the specific emphasis *iti Kauṭalyaḥ.* The reason for this underlining of his own name is clear, because the adjoining text cites other authorities of the science either by name, or together in a group as *ity ācāryāḥ*; and the opinion qualified with Kauṭalya's name differs from the others in important particulars, or contradicts them all flatly. Only in three of the *78* cases does *iti Kauṭalyaḥ* occurs without

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

any other *ācārya* or contrary views in the context. The presumption is therefore very strong that in these cases (namely in 3.4, 7.15, and 13.4), some other opinions have been lost from the original composition. That the name of an authority, even of Kauṭalya himself, could drop out along with the maxim is proved by the sentences reported as additive variants to Shāma Sāstri's text of 8.1 and 8.2 (pp. 324, 325 of his edition); the extra quotations appear as part of the main text in the edition by T. Gaṇapati Śāstri. This precisely illustrates my thesis that the text has been steadily whittled down by inadvertent negligence in successive transcription.

One of these rare, solitary Kauṭalya citations does not appear in Shāma Sāstri's index namely, that in 1.7. However, it occurs in that part of the Southern text which is covered also by the Northern fragment, and is well worth discussing for that reason. In 1.7, the southern texts agree in giving the sentence: *artha eva pradhānaḥ iti Kauṭalyaḥ; artha-mūlau hi dharma-kāmāv iti.* North drops out the first half, before our semicolon; neither version fits the context at all well. The *iti* here indicates what is left of a quotation, so that South is more plausible, but the source might not be Kauṭalya himself. The phrase after the semicolon appears again in 8.3, but as part of a quotation from the Parāśara school, to which Kauṭalya is there strongly opposed; it is cited anonymously as a type of maxim in 15.1. The text that precedes the quotation in 1.7 absolutely requires (and appears disjointed for lack of) some discussion of *dharma, artha,* and *kāma* (say: ethics, economics, erotics) in relation to each other. In both North and South, haplography is indicated; the scribe's eye must have jumped to the word *artha* repeated further on. The mark of such a happening indicates that very few manuscripts of the work existed at that time. This illustrates once again the effect of long disuse and fading away of the level-headed, frankly treacherous, and realistic theory of prefeudal statecraft.

One may feel tempted to make a similar conjecture about the tenth book, where it seems to me that tactical considerations: *patty-aśva-ratha-hasti-karmāṇi* are not sufficiently developed in the southern text that now survives. The main reason would be that the structure and purpose of the army changed. The word *patti* means the heavy-armed soldier of the line, a hoplite, in the *Arth.*, but a combined squad in later works. New tactical units such as the *gulma* (which only means thicket or wharf in the *Arth.*) made up of combined arms were used also for policing the countryside from Sātavāhana times. This has been argued elsewhere.[8] The only guide we have at present outside the text itself is Kāmandakī's *Nītisāra,*[9] written under the influence of Cāṇakya's work. But this is rather dangerous as a guide because both tone and content show how the basis of society and of the state had developed, and the extent to which the great Magadhan *arthaśāstra* tradition had fallen into desuetude. The trivial verses variously ascribed to Cāṇakya under the titles: *Cāṇakya-nīti-sāra, vṛddha-Cāṇakya,* etc., mark the penultimate stage to complete oblivion.

It may at least be said that Muni Jinavijayaji's edition, even of so tiny a portion of the Northern text, will be a stimulus to the internal criticism of the *Arth.*, a task very well worth the attempt and one which must soon be undertaken.

---

[8] D. D. Kosambi, *Introduction to the Study of Indian History* (Bombay, 1956), pp. 76-8; for the *Arth.* state, ibid., pp. 199-226.

[9] *Nītisāra of Kāmandakī*, ed., T. Gaṇapati Śāstri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 14 (1912).

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Mon, 9 Feb 2015 02:22:57 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions